

REMARKS

The communication from the USPTO dated April 21, 2004 alleges that the reply filed on March 8, 2004 is not fully responsive to the prior Office Action. Specifically, the communication alleges that the reply fails to point out how claims 10 and 11 are patentable over the references.

The undersigned wishes to thank Examiner Klimowicz for the courtesy extended during the discussion of this application. During this discussion, it was agreed that the March 8th reply complies with 37 C.F.R 1.111 and MPEP Section 714.02 by pointing out that "[c]laims 10 and 11 each depends from claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons advanced with respect to claim 1." 3/8/04 Reply, page 12. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that the March 8th reply is fully responsive to the prior office action.

Entry and consideration of the March 8th reply are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By:



Michael J. Shea
Reg. No. 34,725

MJS:lmr
1100 North Glebe Road, 8th Floor
Arlington, VA 22201-4714
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100